



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/819,462	03/28/2001	Carl Steven Baumann	END9 2000 0165 US1	3427
44755	7590	01/22/2008		
SHELLEY M BECKSTRAND PATENT ATTORNEY 61 GLENMONT ROAD WOODLAWN, VA 24381			EXAMINER MILEF, ELDA G	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3692	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			01/22/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 09/819,462	Applicant(s) BAUMANN ET AL.	
	Examiner Elda Milef	Art Unit 3692	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 11/13/2007.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,10-13,17 and 19 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,10-13,17 and 19 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. This office action is in response to the amendments submitted by the applicants on 11/13/2007.

- Claims 2-9, 14-16, and 18 are cancelled.
- Claims 1, 10, 13, 17 and 19 are amended.
- Claims 1, 10-13, 17 and 19 are pending in the application.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US 6,507,826 Maners in view of *University of New Hampshire Financial and Administrative Procedures*, hereinafter, Procedures.

Re Claim 1: Maners discloses the invention substantially as claimed including in a method for approving and paying an invoice for commodities (Abstract), the steps of:
receiving a requisition from a requestor of commodities (Col. 2, lines 6-26);

marking said commodities upon said requisition as receivable commodities, receivable commodities including selected commodities that do not flow through a receiving dock (inherent to commodities deemed to require invoice authorization for payment; associated receiving ticket requires recipient confirmation). Maners discloses marking said commodity as "posted" status which indicates that the invoice has been processed by the MicroEDI server and determined valid and submitted to the company accounts payable system for payment processing. –see Fig. 4 and col. 6 lines 48-67. The system and method disclosed by Maners allows vendors to invoice a company for items such as products and services –see col. 5 lines 64-67; col. 8 lines 21-23, (services do not flow through a receiving dock as disclosed by the applicant on p.5 of the specification).

receiving said invoice for commodities from a vendor (Col. 6, lines 49-62);

matching said invoice to said purchase order and determining if said invoice relates to an item designated on said invoice as receivable(col. 5, lines 40-58; Col. 6, lines 6-67; col. 8, lines 21-29 and Figure 4 (Invoice number, order number, Refused status);

upon determining that said invoice includes an item requiring positive confirmation blocking payment of said invoice (invoice is assigned a "refused status" or "operational hold status" pending authorization)-see col. 6 lines 48-67;

generating from said invoice a notification to an authorizer that includes information needed to pay the invoice and choices of authorizing or rejecting payment (Col. 8, line 63 to Col. 9, line 50;;

for commodities marked as receivable, executing a positive confirmation process (Col. 6, lines 6-65; Col. 7 line 56 to Col. 8 line 6; Col. 8 line 63 to Col.9 line 52), including:

responsive to authorization by said authorizer, creating an automated receipt transaction file and entering said transaction file into a payment system (Col. 9, lines 38-44) within an enterprise resource planning system (Col. 3, line 59 to Col. 4, line 3 and Col. 6, line 21 to Col. 10, line 17); and

responsive to rejection by said requestor, creating an e-mail notification to accounts payable for returning said invoice to said vendor (Col. 6, lines 38-67; Col. 9, lines 44-52 and Col.8, lines 21-29);

for commodities marked as non-receivable, executing a negative confirmation process (Col. 5, lines 40-58).

Maners further discloses the use of buttons to select among alternatives (Figs. 4-9) and alternative selection between authorizing (approved) and rejecting (refused) invoices (Fig. 3). Maners does not specifically disclose that a button is used to select between these alternatives. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Maners to use a selection button to authorize or reject an invoice because this would provide a familiar and easily used interface element for an authorizer to indicate such a choice.

Maners further discloses positive and negative "processing"; the "processing" is directly related to positive or negative approvals of invoices for purchased commodities, as cited. The system of Maners disclose commodities that do no flow through a receiving dock ("services" as indicated in the above rejection) and separates the invoices that are positive versus negative by indicating if a an invoice is posted or refused and therefore "marks" the transaction.

Maners teaches an invoice processing system including an invoice processing server providing a payment authorization signal to an accounting computer system to initiate

processing payment of the invoice in response to determining the invoice is authorized for payment.-see Abstract and col. 9 lines 23-44. Furthermore, Maners discloses an authorizing agent utilizing a computer and interface to accept or reject the invoice by setting the invoice status to refused or authorized.-see col. 9 lines 23-52.

The Claims further recite limitation of a three-way match among invoice, purchase order and received goods as well as a “goods receipt”. Maners does not specifically disclose this limitation. Procedures discloses these limitations on pages 1-11, particularly page 1, underlined text and lines 3-5 wherein Procedures discloses (“Special conditions...are also captured on the receipt.”), also refer to pages 3, 5, 8, and 10. Procedures discloses a three way match system including matching information disclosed on a purchase order, invoice, and received goods, and the generating of a receipt. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Maners to include the three way matching disclosed by Procedures because this would have assured that goods ordered were indeed delivered per purchase order and approved by recipient.

3. Claims 10-13, 17, 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Maners in view of Procedures as applied to claim 1 above in further view of Furphy et al. (hereinafter Furphy, US Patent 6,882,983).

Re Claim 10: Maners does not specifically disclose scheduled sending of payment acceptances to a backend procurement system. Official Notice is taken that it was old and well known to schedule financial data transfers for regular transmission. For example, batch processing was a familiar way to transfer data. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary

skill in the art at the time of the invention to perform such data transfer in Maners because this would provide timely, predictable workloads for the system.

Furthermore, Maners discloses communication between the MicroEDI Server and with the computer system at a vendor site via a network server-see col. 3 line 40 to col. 5. Maners does not specifically disclose the steps of recording a goods receipt indicating the acceptance or rejection of payment of an invoice by said requestor to a database. Furphy however, teaches (“Both buying companies 11 and selling companies 13 provide their purchase order data, receipt data, and invoice data to the interactive platform 15, where the data is managed, discrepancies resolved, payments provided for, and records kept. The trading partners complete transactions and communicating with each other via the interactive platform 15. Reports relating to transactions, financial data, and other accounting data are available via the interactive platform 15...The interactive platform 15 conduct these accounts receivable and accounts payable operations utilized identical data from a single database.”)-see col. 5 lines 20-42; col. 2 lines 57-67; col. 10 lines 40-42; col. 11 lines 30-67; col. 13 lines 15-23, 40-52; col. 15 in particular the following passage (“The data regarding the various transactions and resolutions of the present invention are stored for report generations, historical and audit purposes. These data may be obtained through various databases...”)). It is obvious from the teachings of Furphy that information is continually sent and updated to the procurement system and thus in the database because of the constant influx and change of data relating to order processing namely accounts receivable, accounts payable and receipt data. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Maners and Procedures to specifically disclose the steps of recording a goods receipt to a database as taught by Furphy in

order to process transactions and remit funds to the parties involved in the transactions in a timely manner.

Re Claim 11: see the discussion of claim 10. Furthermore, Maners discloses posting of accepted invoices to the company accounts payable computer system for payment processing.- see col. 5 lines 40-53; col. 6 lines 48-67.

Re Claim 12: Maners does not specifically disclose notification of a confirmation notice at login. Official Notice is taken that it was old and well known to provide important information to a user upon first access to a data system. For example, the notification "You've got mail!" was used to draw a users attention to new incoming e-mail. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Maners to include such notification upon login because this would provide timely notification of a user of important information regarding payment authorization.

Re Claim 13: see the discussion of Claims 1 and 10. Furthermore, Furphy discloses a system of authorizing a payment of an invoice by comparing the invoice to a receipt.-see cols. 1 to 3; col. 15 lines 34-64 in particular comparing purchase order data, the invoice data and the receipt data. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Maners and Procedures to specifically include authorizing payment by comparing purchase order data with invoice data and receipt data as taught by Furphy in order to reduce redundancies in the discrepancy resolution process and reduce the unnecessary administrative infrastructure associated with the processing of invoices and purchase orders.

Re Claim 17: see the discussion of Claims 1 and 13 above and Maners further discloses a program storage device embodying instructions to perform the recited steps at Fig. 2, ele. 202 and related text. Furthermore, Maners teaches determining if an item for goods on said invoice is for a commodity item marked on said purchase order as receivable or non-receivable. –see col. 7 lines 25–col. 8 line 5 and cols. 1–2, Fig. 4 and related text. Maners teaches (“This purchase order information is considered part of the reference data 218 that is exchanged between the company accounting system 206 and the MicroEDI Database 214 via the local area network 204.”) It is obvious that for the authorization for an invoice to be paid, and for the invoice to reflect the status as posted, incomplete, ready or refused, the information included in the purchase order is exchanged between the systems disclosed by Maners.

Re Claim 19: see the discussion of Claims 1 and 17.

Response to Arguments

4. Applicant's arguments with respect to claim 1, 10–13, 17, 19 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

5. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after

the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Elda Milef whose telephone number is (571)272-8124. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday -Thursday 8:30 am to 4:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kambiz Abdi can be reached on (571)272-6702. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Kambiz Abdi/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3621

/Elda Milef/
Examiner
Art Unit 3692

Application/Control Number: 09/819,462
Art Unit: 3692

Page 10